

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to more particularly describe the invention. The amendments are supported in the original claims. Claim 1 has been amended to indicate that aliphatic and/or cycloaliphatic diisocyanates are used. The amendment is supported at page 4, line 4. Claim 2 has been amended to more particularly describe the invention and to indicate that the molecular weight is a number average value. Support for the amendments can be found in the original claims and at page 15, lines 22-27. Claims 3-5 have been amended to include method steps. The amendments are supported in the original claims, at page 20, lines 29-31 and at page 21, lines 22-25. Claim 8 has been amended to depend from Claim 7.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

The Examiner indicates that the term "obtainable" in Claims 1 and 6 is indefinite. The term has been replaced with "obtained," indicating that the compounds are obtained by reacting components as set forth in the claims.

The Examiner indicates that "by" is used incorrectly in Claim 2. The term has been replaced with "from" to indicate that the polyisocyanates are formed from diisocyanates, etc.

The Examiner questions the dependency of Claim 8, which has been amended to depend from Claim 7.

The Examiner indicates that Claims 3-5 do not include a method/process step. Claims 3-5 have been amended to include a method step.

Claims 3-5 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for failing to include a process step. Claims 3-5 have been amended to include a method step.

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

The Examiner indicates that Claim 2 fails to comply with the enablement requirement by not indicating the basis of the stated molecular weight. Claim 2 has been amended to indicate that the molecular weight is a number average molecular weight.

The Examiner indicates that only aliphatic and/or cycloaliphatic diisocyanates are supported in the specification. Claim 1 has been so amended.

As all of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112 have been addressed, they should be withdrawn.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-8 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Claims 10-13 of copending application No. 10/613,457.

Applicants submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer, which overcomes the double patenting rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of Claims 1-8 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Joseph C. Gil
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 26,602

Bayer MaterialScience LLC
100 Bayer Road
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15205-9741
(412) 777-3813
FACSIMILE PHONE NUMBER:
(412) 777-3902
s:\shared\kgb\jcg3342am